UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Abandon the Economic Complex!
- - - - - - *Ira H. Frantz*

The Menace of Militarism in the United States
- - - - *Hugh Stevenson Tigner*

Citizens of the World
- - - - *Virginia C. Gildersleeve*

Sanctions and Non-Recognition
- - - - - - *S. O. Levinson*

An Excursion Into the Southland
- - - - *John Haynes Holmes*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXVII NUMBER 9

Chicago, July 6, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 163

ARTICLES—
The Dream of Tomorrow—*Robert G. Ingersoll* 163
Abandon the Economic Complex!—IRA H. FRANTZ 166
The Menace of Militarism in the United States—HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER 168
Citizens of the World—VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE 170
Sanctions and Non-Recognition—S. O. LEVINSON 172
An Excursion Into the Southland—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 173

POETRY—
We Who Would Live—DOROTHY A. LINNEY 171
Only Son—MOLLY MARR SCHULTZ 172
We Believe—ALICE FERRIN HENSEY 174

THE STUDY TABLE—
A New Biography of Theodore Parker—MORTIMER B. SMITH 175
Imperial Hearst—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 176
Veblen—HAROLD D. LASSWELL 176
American Letters—CHARLES ARTHUR HAWLEY 177

CORRESPONDENCE—
How to Get Good Citizens—LUCIA AMES MEAD 177
Inflation and Wages—F. S. KINDER 178

THE FIELD—
Statement on Reorganization of the League of Nations—*The League of Nations Association* 162
Conference of Christian Pacifists, Cambridge, England, July 28-August 4, 1936—*International Fellowship of Reconciliation* 179
Bureau of Research and Documentation 179
Planks on Peace Approved by the National Peace Conference—*Chicago Peace Council* 179
Has Military Training Real Educational Value?—*Committee on Education for International Goodwill* 180

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Statement on Reorganization of the League of Nations

By The League of Nations Association of the United States

The conquests of Ethiopia and Manchuria confront the world with a failure of the collective system, as applied, to maintain the principles of the Covenant of the League of Nations and of the Kellogg Pact. This failure, while for the moment increasing alarm at the prospect of general war, need not be a major disaster. The statesmen of the world are now taking stock of their efforts in the light of sixteen years' experience. Such a reconsideration of the situation in which the League of Nations finds itself is not a sign of weakness; on the contrary it is called for by the vitality of the idea of collective security and the overwhelming desire of the people for peace.

The League of Nations Association affirms its conviction that the League of Nations must be made more effective and that this can be done by the application of the following principles:

(1) Acceptance of the Kellogg Pact as the fundamental and guiding principle of a universal league;

(2) Establishment within the orbit of this universal league of arrangements for peaceful modification of the status quo and for the advancement of social and economic justice;

(3) Gradation of obligations for maintaining collective security in accordance with the geographical position and special situation of states;

(4) Separation of the Covenant of the League of Nations from the Treaty of Versailles.

The period through which the world community is passing might be compared to what is called the "critical period" in American history under the Articles of Confederation, when the American union needed to be examined and strengthened. In the last sixteen years the structure of peace has been subjected to similar strains. The need for this structure remains as valid as when it was first planned. The only alternative to an effective organization of the world community is the war system. The task confronting us is not changed, only clarified and made more urgent. For further information, write to The League of Nations Association, 8 West 40th Street, New York City.

(*Continued on page* 179)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVII MONDAY, JULY 6, 1936 No. 9

THE DREAM OF TOMORROW

A vision of the future arises. I see a world where thrones have crumbled and where kings are dust. The aristocracy of idleness has perished from the earth.

I see a world without a slave. Man at last is free. Nature's forces have by science been enslaved. Lightning and light, wind and wave, frost and flame, and all the subtle powers of earth and air are the tireless toilers for the human race.

I see a world at peace, adorned with every form of art, with music's myriad voices thrilled; where lips are rich with words of love and truth; a world in which no exile sighs, no prisoner mourns; a world on which the gibbet's shadow does not fall; a world where labor reaps its full reward, where work and worth go hand in hand.

I see a world without the beggar's outstretched palm, the miser's heartless, stony stare, the piteous wail of want, the livid lips of lies, the cruel eyes of scorn.

I see a race without disease of flesh or brain, shapely and fair, married harmony of form and function—and, as I look, life lengthens, joy deepens, in the great dome shines the eternal star of Faith.

Robert G. Ingersoll

A WORD TO THE FAMILY

UNITY's circulation is beginning to move again. New subscribers are coming in. We have been suffering losses during these last few years, and thus seeing our subscription list go down, and *down*. There was nothing we could do about it. No churches to appeal to for aid; no societies or organized groups of any kind to help us out; no money for advertising or other publicity devices! So we just sat tight, waiting for the depression to blow by, and hoping that we would not perish before the weather changed. That it was a hard struggle goes without saying. Had it not been for that peculiarly intimate and even affectionate loyalty which binds the subscribers of UNITY to one another and to the paper in a fellowship which is itself as real as any church, we could not have survived. But the members of the family stood by—all did who could!—and now we are gaining new members, and the good old days are in sight again. What we need, right off, is a large increase in circulation. Why shouldn't we have it? The management of UNITY was never more vigorous and alert, its editorial mind never more free, its array of writers, book reviewers, poets never before so large and able, its whole policy and purpose never so much needed as at this moment when prejudice, hate, and the menace of war lower upon us like approaching storms. We are constantly told, to our vast encouragement, that "there is no paper like UNITY." But if that is so, why shouldn't more people, like-minded with ourselves, know about it, and join, as we believe they would be glad to join, our fellowship of faith? Come, friends, help us! Here is our paper, prepared and published with labor and love. But we can't distribute it without your cooperation. It is *you* who must take this paper and get it into the hands and hearts of those who would rejoice in it and sustain it even as you do. Why should not each present subscriber find at least one new subscriber? Our subscription list doubled! Think of what that would mean!!

THE CONVENTIONS—AND A THIRD PARTY

The Republican Convention presented some novelty and a modicum of encouragement, whereas the Democratic Convention was as stupid and tawdry as a set of old-time fireworks. Of course, there was nothing for the Democrats to do but go through the motions. From Chairman Farley's call-to-order at the start to President Roosevelt's speech at the close, everything was cut-and-dried and thus strictly according to expectations. The Republicans have been equally trite in days gone by under the same circumstances, but this year the uncertainties of candidate and platform gave a chance for free action which was not altogether lost. The candidate nominated, Mr. Landon, seems to be as delightful a personality as his Democratic rival, but an unknown quantity as presidential timber. The platform is a hodge-podge of compromises and contradictions. But the great thing is the capture of the G. O. P. by a new, young, and idealistic group of politicians with the Old Guard in full retreat. Such movement as there was at Cleveland was to the left and toward the future. But more important than either of these two conventions, at least as regards the immediate campaign, is the third-party nomination of Lemke and O'Brien, as candidates of Father Coughlin's Union of Social Justice, Dr. Townsend's Old Age Pension movement, and the late Huey Long's Share the Wealth movement. That these

three groups have had to get together shows their waning strength and forecasts their speedy extinction. But, meanwhile, this phantasmagoria of queer politics and queerer finance can command enough of a following during the next few months to play hob with the two old parties. If ever there was a perfect piece of demagogic dictatorship it was Coughlin's presentation of the ticket and platform of the new party in a radio speech of ineffably disgusting nonsense. But there will be millions to follow on, as there are millions to embrace every fad and folly. The chief danger of this development is, of course, to the Democrats. If Lemke's candidacy really gets organized and in the field, our guess is that it will defeat Roosevelt hands down, and thus give the victory to Landon.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION MARCHES ON!

More important than any news from Cleveland, Philadelphia or Washington these days is the news from Moscow. The Russian revolution is fulfilling itself. From the beginning, all free and understanding minds have seen that "the dictatorship of the proletariat" was a phenomenon not to be confused with the Fascist and Nazi dictatorships. There might be and were dreadful cruelties in the former as in the latter, but the fundamental spirit and purpose, and therefore significance, were wholly different. Is it imaginable, for example, that what is now taking place under Stalin could ever take place under Mussolini or Hitler? Ever since the 1917 revolution, the Bolshevist leaders have insisted that their Communist Party was acting on the one hand, as the protector of the Russian masses against their enemies, and, on the other hand, as their tutor or guardian—"to teach them," as Walter Duranty has put it, "self-respect and discipline, and to fit them for self-government." Now the Soviets have come of age, the government was eighteen years old last November 7th! The country is united, and no longer afraid of enemies either at home or abroad. Without question the day of terror and repression is over, and the day of freedom has at last come. As a sign and guaranty of the new era, a new constitution of the U. S. S. R. is now being drawn, and perhaps will be published before this editorial can be printed, abolishing the dictatorship and establishing self-government. In place of the inner council of the Party will now be placed a bicameral parliament, the lower house of which will be elected by the people, and the upper house chosen by the federated republics. Election will be by secret ballot; citizenship will be universal, without regard to sex, class, creed, or social origin; courts will be presided over by elected judges; freedom of speech, press, and religion will be guaranteed; and protection is promised to private property, which means homes, furnishings, and articles of personal consumption and comfort. "All this," writes Walter Duranty in the New York *Times* "means an unprecedented move toward a democratic system." It is the most important news in the world today.

THE END OF SANCTIONS—AND THE LEAGUE

Second only to the stupendous events in Russia is the tragedy of Geneva, the first act of which was staged dramatically in London. When Sir Anthony Eden stood up in the Commons and announced Britain's assent to the withdrawal of sanctions against Italy, his speech marked the close of an epoch in European history. More than any other contemporary statesman, Sir Anthony was pledged to the destiny of the League of Nations as embodied in the policy of sanctions. When this man made confession of failure, it was the end. The end not merely of the policy adopted against Mussolini a year ago, but of the whole policy denominated as "sanctions" under Article XVI of the Covenant! This policy has been debated endlessly *pro* and *con*. UNITY has made clear its stand on the issue. But all such debate is now purely academic. The policy of sanctions was tried in a great crisis of European history, on an issue of military aggression against the peace of the world as clear as the noonday sun, in the instance of a conqueror as selfish and ruthless as Bonaparte, and it has failed—failed beyond any hope of repair or resurrection. It may be argued that this policy was not adequately supported—that, if supported, it would have beaten Italy to her knees—that, without any use of arms, a superbly effective weapon was in our grasp, or, on the other hand, as Eden now contends, that this weapon could never be effective except as and until it led to war, and war for sanctions is as fatal as any other kind of war. But all this is mere idle chatter on a dead issue. Sanctions, we repeat, have been tried, have failed, and will never be tried again. Sanctions are done for—and so is the League, the whole life of which has been made dependent upon sanctions! Even the New York *Times*, unfaltering champion of the Wilsonian handiwork, announces that "The League of Nations is dead," and confesses that only a complete reorganization can save at all the idea of international cooperation. It is all this which marks an epoch in history. The period which began in 1919 has ended. What now lies before?

WORKERS STRIKE AGAINST SOCIALISM

The strike of the French workers on the eve of Mr. Blum's entrance into office as the first Socialist Premier of France triumphantly mystified everybody, most certainly including the newspaper correspondents. These accomplished journalists wrote about the event not at all with clarity, but in a kind of daze which confused us all. Here were the workers acting just as though the Right had won in the recent election, or as though the Fascists were at the gates of Paris. As

a matter of fact, Socialists backed by Communists were in full control of the Republic. Was M. Blum suspect? Were the workers, rejoicing over their political power, making a show of strength and daring the new Premier or his opponents to delay the legislative ratification of the voters' will? Explanations may be many, and none satisfactory except the certainty that we are living in chaotic days in which any kind of an upheaval is in any place and at any time possible. Meanwhile, the fear of the proletariat, if not of God, was put into the souls of Blum and his colleagues in the French ministry, and any danger of indecisive action is, for the moment at least, quite removed from the picture. In the face of such a spectacle as this, one wonders what the workers of the world might not do, if they acted under trained leadership instead of under mere impulse, and on behalf not of their own class interests, but of mankind. Take the question of war, for example! Suppose that not merely in France, but in all countries, the hundreds of thousands of workers dropped tools, stopped machines, tied up transportation and food supplies, the moment governments threatened war! In France, in this recent crisis, something like 800,000 workers came out, and for a few hours paralyzed the nation's life. Premier Blum had to broadcast an appeal for a truce, and, like an obedient schoolboy, promise anything and everything the strikers wanted. Here was a perfect demonstration of the fact that the workers, when acting together, have power—supreme power. Well, why not use it when it most needs to be used—at the time when war threatens the destruction of everything? Let it be said that the church has no such power as this. Every priest and pastor in the world might strike, and nothing would happen. But the workers—that's another matter! The workers, in other words, can make or unmake governments, and this means that, more than any other social group, they are responsible for war and peace.

ARAB AND JEW IN ZION

The present disorders in Palestine are probably the most serious outbreak since the Jews began their great work of rebuilding Zion upon the hills of the ancient homeland. Serious, that is to say, from the standpoint of loss of life and destruction of property, but not, we believe, from the standpoint of the ultimate destiny of the country! Two facts, not often mentioned or even recognized, we regard as central to the whole situation. First, the uprising of the Arab population is fundamentally an attack upon the British Empire. The Jews are being hit only indirectly as the wards, so to speak, of the Empire. What we have at work here is an upheaval not of anti-Semitism, as in Germany and Poland, but of the intense nationalistic sentiment of a people who resent the intrusion of Britain into what was promised them, in the days of the Great War, as the new Arab Empire of the Near East. To get rid of the British, not to slaughter the Jews, is the real purpose at heart. We are persuaded that, if the complication of the Mandate were removed, it would be entirely possible, in course of time, for Jews and Arabs to work out together their common destiny. This brings us to the second fact above referred to—namely, that Jews and Arabs on the land, and even in the cities, have no hatred or hostility towards each other. For years, now, the common people of both races have been working together, and thus steadily growing together in mutual understanding and interest. The Arabs know that the Jews are bringing prosperity to Palestine, and therewith raising their standards of living, and therewith in turn delivering them from their ancient feudal bondage to their rich overlords. It is these powerful landowners at the top who are deliberately fomenting, through appeals to religious prejudices and political passion, such trouble as now exists between the peoples of Israel and Islam. Even so, at this time, as in the massacres of 1929, the Arab trouble-makers have to import remote tribesmen from Trans-Jordania and elsewhere to do the killings and burnings which their own people, who know the Jews, will not perpetrate. Leave the workers alone, and they will join hearts, as they have already joined hands, to achieve a common happiness in a land which they share together! In the end the Arabs will be delivered of their overlords, and then with the Jews will make terms with Britain and thus be delivered of the Mandate. However dark the present, the future is bright.

GILBERT K. CHESTERTON, POET

Gilbert K. Chesteron, dead on June 14th last, was the most brilliant of all contemporary English authors. Not only in its famous paradoxes, but in its whole texture and color, his style was a thing of magic. Even in his fugitive journalistic pieces, he wrote like an immortal. His versatility was amazing. There was apparently nothing in literature he could not do, and do well. His essays are among the best in our language. His religious studies have an enduring value. Among many biographies which came from his pen, his study of Charles Dickens is unrivalled as a piece of literary criticism. His novels, especially that cosmic and comic fantasy, *The Man Called Thursday,* are among the finest of their day. His Father Brown detective stories are outdone only by the incomparable Sherlock Holmes tales. His dramas were produced on the stages of London and New York. But it was as a poet that we believe he was greatest and will be longest remembered. We count it strange that Chesterton was so seldom ranked among the leading poets of our time. Perhaps it was because he wrought such brilliant work in so many other and more popular fields of literature, that he himself obscured his poetry, as Scott's Waverly Novels have always tended to overshadow Scott's ro-

mantic verse. But when many, perhaps most, of his books have been forgotten, Chesterton's poetry will still be remembered and read as among the chief glories of English letters. Is not *Don John of Austria* the greatest thing of its kind? If anything can match it, is it not *The Ballad of the White Horse?* Who that has read them can ever forget *The Donkey, The Wife of Flanders,* the Christmas pieces, and the lyrics? Of all modern hymns, we regard Chesterton's *O God of Earth and Altar* as the noblest, and hymns are not to be despised. Gilbert K. Chesterton himself was like a man stepped from a fantastic page. His huge bulk, his enormous gusto, his prodigious mirth overlaying a deep seriousness and reverence, his utter simplicity and unfailing good nature, all these made him memorable. British manhood, as well as British genius, was in him.

Abandon the Economic Complex!

IRA H. FRANTZ

The development of an adequate production system, which our generation has witnessed, challenges us to match it with an equally efficient system of distribution and thus make our whole economic machine a servant instead of the despot it now is.

The economic phase of life dominates us to a degree that should not be necessary. It constitutes a major factor in the choice of occupation. It influences the extent and character of educational courses. It shapes our thought, determines our political faith, and leaves its mark upon our religion. With most of us the problem of satisfying the material needs of a decent standard of living looms large. The necessity of accumulating for the inevitable "rainy day" cultivates, and seems to justify, the acquisitive impulse. Success in acquisition leads to an inordinate and insatiable desire to accumulate more and more. The term economic "complex" has been chosen advisedly.

The existence of the economic complex is not difficult to understand. The task of subduing the earth to make it yield not only food and shelter but also radios, schoolhouses, and hospitals has required the major share of the physical and intellectual energies of the race. While it would be foolhardy to suggest that there remains nothing more to be accomplished in the way of increasing the abundant life, it is nevertheless a well substantiated fact that a comfortable and even a high standard of living for all is now easily possible. In an age of scarcity there was excuse for an economic struggle; with the condition of scarcity successfully overcome, the economic struggle should be outlawed. Why struggle any longer over goods? In the arid regions of the west, people sometimes struggle over water. But in our town we do not. Nobody cares how much anybody else uses.

The economic struggle, however, is now only secondarily a struggle over goods. Primarily it is a struggle over money. Nobody wants an excess of meat. It would quickly become worse than useless. But we do want to know we may have meat as we need it. We want security. Since money offers the only hope of security in sight, we want money. Or we want money for the power it gives us. Because money and goods are exchangeable and interdependent, the struggle over money results in a maldistribution of goods. The greediest money-grabber in the world probably does not wish that any other person shall be hungry. But as long as the economic struggle continues it is certain that there will be deserving persons who will suffer lack. Because success in the struggle depends more on being shrewd and "hard-boiled" than on rendering useful service, those who serve best often fare worst and those who prosper most may be selfish and antisocial.

We shall never be able to outlaw the economic struggle while money remains a major objective. As long as financial accumulation constitutes the chief business of life, so long will we have struggle. And as long as a man's security in his declining years depends on his investments and savings, the accumulation of wealth is bound to be a major objective in his life. For who shall say when he has enough to take care of himself in his old age? How may he know his investments are secure? Even if he could be certain of his security, how shall he shift his emphasis from money-making to something else after years of intense concentration on accumulating a comfortable fortune?

Greed and struggle are inherent in our system of private ownership and bargaining. The time has come when we must devise a Christian economic order to meet the opportunity offered by the new conditions. In the name of justice to the millions of the dispossessed and for the sake of our own souls, we who seek to build the Kingdom of God must begin to think in new terms.

We have been thinking in terms of money. We have made money the hub of the economic wheel. Every man knows that his economic problem is a problem of getting money. Who has decreed that money must be the measure of our economic life? Our economic goal is not money; what we seek is the largest possible use of material goods. When money proves itself hopelessly inadequate as a means to this end why should we still depend on it? Money is man's invention as truly as was the horse-drawn carriage. Is it certain that the inventors of improved transportation can invent no improved method of distribution?

The possibilities of a system of moneyless distribution are beginning to engage the attention of many thoughtful people. The suggestion offered here, limited by space to a bare outline,* is made in the hope that it will stimulate thought on these possibilities. Those who are sincere in rating general welfare above individual privilege will be able to overcome their first unfavorable reaction and honestly examine this suggestion for any possible values it may contain.

A moneyless economics would presuppose the collective ownership of capital goods. This idea is not new and need not be discussed here. The proposed plan would go farther than socialism, however, by undertaking (1) the distribution of labor according to every man's ability and the total needs of society, and

*Mr. Frantz is writing a book on this subject which will appear in due course.—Editor.

(2) the distribution of goods according to every man's need and the total production capacity.

If we are to make full use of our ever increasing machines, it is a certainty that we shall never again be able to give full-time employment to all. We must therefore undertake a scientific distribution of labor. Distribution of labor in a machine age is quite a different thing from distribution of labor in colonial days. One plan might be to require that every man work for a certain period of his life, allowing plenty of time for education and providing early retirement. This period should be made of proper length to provide for all the necessary work of the world and it should be rewarded with a high standard of living and economic security for life. Every man should be allowed to choose his own work, requiring only that he be fitted for the work he chooses. By discarding money and the need of accumulating, we would eliminate the scramble for jobs. Unemployment for none and leisure for all would result. By making the required period of labor a requisite for sharing the distribution of goods we should have little or no difficulty in securing from every person his just share of work.

The second problem would be the equitable distribution of goods. Bear in mind that there is enough for all. We are finding that distribution of scarcity and distribution of plenty are very different problems. Money and bargaining were designed for scarcity. Distribution of plenty may be in the form of a monthly credit, ample for the needs of the month but void with the beginning of the new month. This would eliminate all incentive to hoarding. The credit could be in the units of our present monetary system or any others we might choose. It would, however, not be money in the sense of having any intrinsic value in a gold or silver basis, in the sense that it must be raised by taxation, or that its expenditure offers opportunity for profit taking. It simply means that the most able-bodied portion of our population, with the aid of science and the machine, has produced an ample supply of all kinds of goods and each member of society is now to receive his share—children and students, to afford them their fullest opportunity; workers, as their wages; retired persons, as the just reward of work previously done; the incompetent, as the discharge of the obligation of the strong to help the weak.

How could a change to a moneyless distribution be effected? The first step would be to complete a plan which should represent the best that Christian thought can produce and which could attract responsible, capable Christian leadership. A constitutional amendment should be drafted to meet the new conditions which could not be foreseen when the constitution was written. This amendment should be designed to restore the original American ideals of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The task would then be to "educate, organize, evangelize" in the traditional American spirit.

Is a plan of this kind politically feasible? Is there a possibility it could succeed at the polls? There are two reasons for an affirmative answer: (1) The temper of the times tends toward radicalism. Dr. E. Stanley Jones, out of his thorough acquaintance with world conditions, says, "We must meet radicalism with a wiser and better *radicalism*" (italics mine). The large followings of Huey Long and Dr. Townsend indicate this tendency in America. Incidentally, it will be unfortunate if the seemingly inevitable collapse of the Townsend movement shall leave its followers wholly disillusioned. The goal of complete security for the aged is so reasonable, righteous, and feasible that the vision must not be lost. It must be clear to all that the difficulty is not that we lack goods to meet the needs of all our old people, but that we cannot raise the money. This awakened sense of justice and the reasonable hopes of these millions of sincere people should be capitalized now for the inauguration of a sane but adequate program under competent leadership. We need not fear to undertake a movement because it is radical. The real cause for fear is that radicalism will follow irresponsible leadership and be led to violence and chaos. (2) Because it undertakes a *complete* and *immediate* solution of the economic problem, this plan of a moneyless economics would arouse the enthusiasm of the mass of voters.

Would such distribution be fair? It would! In the first place, the laborer who builds sewers or keeps them open renders as necessary and valuable a service to us as the surgeon who removes our appendixes. He needs as much and as good food and as comfortable surroundings as the surgeon. Since we are able to provide well for both, it is but just that we do it. The man in the lower brackets may have security without taking it from the man higher up. What then would be the incentive to undertake the more skilled occupations? Let the question be answered by another: Is there danger that surgeons would all desert their operating tables and apply for jobs as sewer cleaners if the latter offered as good pay? Or that the locomotive driver would seek a job shoveling concrete?

But in the second place, superior economic rewards lose value and meaning in an economy of abundance. (Is this why we try to perpetuate scarcity?) Imagine a group of surgeons sitting down to a banquet at which it is sought to extend recognition to the most eminent among them by putting double portions of food on their plates? The day will come when all attempts at economic reward for superior services will be just as offensive. There are other incentives to work than the economic. These other incentives will result in better service and greater progress than the acquisitive motive. It is blasphemy against humanity to say that men will not work except from the profit motive. "No amount of pay ever made a good soldier, a good artist, a good teacher, or a good workman."

What advantages might reasonably be expected to accrue from a system of moneyless distribution? First and foremost, complete social security would be realized. By complete security is meant that a man's living would be as secure as nature's bounty and the collective genius of the human race. Every man's living would be his own, earned by his own efforts; it could not be stolen; he could not sell it or give it away. If it be charged that this is Utopian, the answer is that our present production capacity is itself Utopian. Yet this capacity is not a dream but a fact.

The need for personal accumulation would be obviated. Poverty would be ended. Debt would be impossible. Taxes would be abolished. The enormous waste of competition and duplication, and the expense and annoyance of newspaper and radio advertising would be eliminated. Education would not be restricted for lack of finance. Those crimes in which money is the motive would disappear. Discard money and the munitions industry can be controlled. Discard money and you destroy the motive that keeps the liquor industry going. Discard money and we can have what we want in motion pictures.

This would set us free from the economic complex. So doing, it would create soil in which would flourish the richest individualism. The material basis of existence could be made to occupy the relatively minor place in our thought which is now warranted by our "potential product capacity." It would be a long step toward realization of the Kingdom of God.

An early Christian writer had to exhort his readers to leave "first principles" and press on to more important things. That is what we need to do with economics. We shall never get out of this mess until we get our eyes on new objectives. We are like the child who has learned the first principles of reading and has become so fascinated with the letters of the alphabet, word forms, spellings, pronunciations, and grammatical constructions that he does not care to use his reading ability in acquiring thought from books. Economics as a major objective is now as unworthy of our race as a first grade spelling lesson would be unworthy of a college upper-classman. The only way to learn to read rapidly and well is to get interested in the thought rather than the words. By the same rule the only way our economic life will ever be made to function smoothly and efficiently will be for us to get interested in those greater objectives in life which a solid economic foundation will enable us to reach.

The Menace of Militarism in the United States

HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER

When Ahaz, king of Judah, was threatened with an attack by the kings of Israel and Damascus,* his heart and the hearts of his courtiers "quivered like the leaves of a forest before the wind," and he straightway sought to make himself a vassal of the powerful king of Assyria, sending a rich offering of gold and silver, and asking for aid against his enemies. He got the help of the Assyrian armies, but he also got an annual tribute levied upon his kingdom by the Assyrian monarch. Isaiah, the prophet, read the situation, went to see Ahaz while he was inspecting the water reservoirs, preparatory to withstanding a siege, and told him to keep his head on his shoulders. "Don't be afraid," he said, "of those two fag-ends of flickering torches, the kings of Israel and Damascus. Their plan will fail. And as for this alliance with Assyria, you'll pay a heavy price for it."

Some years later, Judah was on the point of revolting against Assyrian rule and for that purpose formed alliances with neighboring states and with Egypt. Again Isaiah came forth to warn and to propose a different policy: "Woe to those," he thundered, "who make their way for help to Egypt, relying on her horse, and on the force of her chariots! O self-willed sons, says the Eternal, bent on no plan of mine, weaving a treaty that I never sanctioned; your safety lies in ceasing to make leagues, your strength is quiet faith. But this you would not have—'No, we must have cavalry to make a charge!'—Your charge shall be a flight;—'We need swift horses'—swift shall be your pursuers!"

It was sound advice and true prophecy. The government did not accept it. They relied on the strength of armies, and the result was a new and greater disaster.

It would be far-fetched to suggest any significant political analogy between Judah in the Eighth Century B. C. and the United States in the Twentieth Century A. D. Yet it is not impossible that Isaiah's advice to his nation might be good counsel to ours. There might be a spiritual analogy between that ancient petty state and this modern world power. I am not at all sure that the proposition Isaiah proclaimed has been disproved. Men and their governments have usually embraced the obvious notion that their strength and security reside in their military machines rather than in something less tangible and immediate. They have usually had more faith in chariots and war-horses than in quietness and confidence. As Teddy Roosevelt put it, "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry." Nations do win temporary advantages by following this cynical policy, but history does not offer convincing evidence that it is a sound one. It is hard to see what the nations of modern Europe have won in the way of strength and security through their great armies and deadly martial implements. It is quite plain that Canada and Mexico have more real security without a huge military machine than if they had one. For one thing, if these countries were mightily armed, their relations with the United States would become threatening. The old saying about those who take up the sword perishing by the sword is not literally true, but it seems to be spiritually true. On the whole and in the long run, it seems to be true. There seems to be something essentially undoing about this sword-wielding business. A sword-studded situation is a decadent situation; the laws of life do not seem to approve of it; they seem to pronounce judgment against swordsmen just as they seemed to pronounce judgment against the dinosaurs. A meeker animal than the dragon was given the heritage of the earth. Nevertheless, the cry everlastingly goes up among the nations, "We must have a larger army and more powerful engines of war."

Our own country in recent years has come to take up that cry, and now sounds it more raucously than any other. In some ways this is a curious phenomenon. We have a traditional distrust of militarism in this republic. Until the Great War, relatively few of our citizens ever saw a soldier. The rank and file of our people have never thought in martial terms. We have never had to repel an invader. The founding fathers warned against our ever having a large standing army. "Militarism" has been one of the most detestable words in our vocabulary. We have prided ourselves on our lack of it, have felt superior to European countries because they were infected with it, and have stuck out our chests and said, "If other countries would only follow our example!" We have not felt that we had to rely on force of arms for our national strength and security. We have chided other nations because they did not feel the same way.

Moreover, we know that there is no danger of our land being invaded. There is no threat from the North or from the South; and the oceans on the east and on the west, even in this day of steamship and aeroplane, are still practically insuperable barriers. Not even the military experts deny this. It would take a

*See Isaiah 30:15 f. and 31 f.

navy at least three times the size of our own to threaten us in our home waters, or even in the region of the Hawaiian Islands. No single power on the globe, and no combination of powers which did not include Great Britain, could think of attacking us near our shores. And then the difficulty of transporting troops and equipment to our territory across either the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans is too stupendous to think about.

Yet something has got into us that has made us forget all this. We have caught another spirit. In a world of clashing imperialisms, military preparation, and diplomatic intrigue, we have embraced a strong faith in the way of Mars. Like Ahaz and his courtiers, our hearts seem to have begun quivering like the leaves of a forest before the wind. And like him we have aped the manner of foreigners. We have outstripped them all. Between 1913 and 1936, Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy and Japan increased their expenditures for army, navy and air forces by an average of 40 per cent. But in that space of time we have increased our war budget by 197 per cent. Nor is this glaring contrast toned down by the fact that we were relatively disarmed in 1913, and so had to increase our expenditures more rapidly than the others. In 1913 we were spending more than twice as much as Japan on our military budget, a third more than Italy, two-thirds as much as France, and almost two-thirds as much as Great Britain—and these last two were definitely preparing for a major war at that date. In 1930 we were spending more for war preparation than any other country is spending even now. In 1936 the war budgets of the great powers are as follows: Japan, $280,000,000; Italy, $400,000,000; Great Britain, $592,000,000; France, $662,000,000; Russia, $665,000,000; the United States, over one thousand million dollars. In other words, we are spending almost twice as much as any other power in the world. We are keeping our navy abreast with Great Britain; we are acquiring the greatest air fleet in the world, with the possible exception of Russia; during the last year, we have increased the enlistment of the Citizens Military Training units and the number of Reserve Officers Training Corps; we have augmented the National Guard; we have authorized six new air bases; we have established an air route to Asia; we have increased the army personnel by around 40 per cent. Our military departments hardly know what it is to have one of their requests to Congress turned down.

Senator Nye* says that for ten years he has sat upon the Senate Appropriations Committee. When the appropriation for the Bureau of Education comes up for consideration, there is always heated debate and the paring knife cuts it down to the bone. When the appropriation for the State Department, which averages around $13,000,000 a year, comes up, vociferous objections are made. "If anyone should be so foolhardy as to propose an additional million to enable the Secretary of State to enlarge upon his activities in the name of world peace, he would be laughed off his feet. Men would rise up in indignant eloquence and demand: 'What madness is it that this man talks?' . . . Such a proposal would be promptly thrown out." But when the military appropriations are taken up, the economic advisers sit as silent as a peck of potatoes. There is no fear then about unbalancing the budget, no pressing need for economy, and no strong objections are made.

I feel sure that the American people are asleep to the meaning and the danger of this amazing militaristic trend. Of course they do not think of it as militarism at all; they think of it as "national defense," as "protection." I do not know why, unless it is due to an abnormal innocence, we should think of this tremendous military preparation as "defense." No other nation on the two American continents feels required to spend anything like a billion dollars a year for defense, although each has some rich natural resources which foreign governments are supposed to covet. Our own War Department does not think of it in terms of defense. All military authorities recognize the practical impossibility of any nation invading our soil unless it possesses a navy several times the size of our own. Our military plans are based upon blueprints which call for the transportation of three million men across thousands of miles of ocean to fight in somebody else's waters and on somebody else's land. If our war staff were interested in genuine defense, it would prevent our inventions and developments in military weapons from being sold to foreign nations. It would be more concerned about the fact that our own munitions manufacturers are doing everything in their power to arm our potential enemies. And it would be more interested in considering the efficiency of our military machine. There is the very greatest doubt about the efficiency of our fighting forces. For one thing, the various branches are not coordinated. For another, our army is scattered all over the country in small posts, so that it is impossible to bring together permanently large bodies of men for tactical training. General William C. Rivers, a graduate of West Point and a lifelong soldier, says that he never saw a whole brigade together until he had to take one into action at Chateau-Thierry. The question of efficiency and of actual needs for actual defense has never, to my knowledge, been taken seriously in this country by anybody with authority to act.

This notion that we are merely assuring our defense, that we are simply adopting temporary and expedient measures to safeguard American society, betrays a hypnotized condition among our citizenry. The truth is that we are becoming more and more militaristic, that we are making war more probable, and that in the name of protecting America we are threatening to destroy those things in our country which we claim especially to cherish. What we are actually doing is constructing a Frankenstein that may some day turn upon his creator and do with him as it pleases.

Huge military machines are dangerous from two aspects. On the one hand, they almost certainly lead to war. They breed suspicion, fear and retaliation in other nations. They ache to be used. They think only in martial terms. They never consider non-military consequences. If they think an air base on the Canadian border a good piece of strategy, they would proceed with it, thoughtless of political repercussions. They regard war as necessary and inevitable, and they tend to think that every strained international relation is the time for war to begin. They tend to dominate the civilian authorities, especially at a time of political crisis. The recent Japanese experience is a lesson on this point. In short, a powerful military machine is militarism, and militarism is inimical to peace.

On the other hand, a strong and influential military clique is a domestic danger. If militarism does not know the ways of world peace, neither does it know the ways of democracy and progress in civilization. We

*In *The Forum* for April, 1936.

are apt to miss the subtle truth of that saying, "He who takes up the sword shall perish by the sword." It is not that the sword-flourisher threatens himself only by calling forth another sword-flourisher to challenge him. That is only half the picture. The sword-flourisher truly becomes a sword-flourisher; he destroys in himself the values of a peaceful life.

I was reading an article the other day in the *Christian Century** by a field supervisor of education in the CCC camps. At the start, this man said, the United States Bureau of Education put out a Handbook for Educational Advisers in the CCC Camps, and one of the aims of the program, it stated, was as follows: "To develop as far as practicable an understanding of the prevailing social and economic conditions, to the end that each man may cooperate intelligently in improving these conditions." Excellent, we say, creative, progressive, intelligent, democratic. No educator could complain. The handbook was approved and circulated to all the camps. But before long it became apparent that, while the vocational and recreational training was getting along nicely, the real social and civic education was getting nowhere. Why?

The trouble was that the army men, who control life in the Civilian Conservation Corps, could not conceive or allow this type of education. One of the cardinal principles of adult education is that students must be taught to think independently. If democracy is to be possible, we must have an intelligent, informed and critical citizenry. But all this is foreign to the army. Its watchword is unquestioning obedience. Nobody in the army ever asks how a "higher-up" arrived at a certain conclusion. The military mind does not understand how citizens should function in a democracy.

This writer went on to say that the officers do not want the boys playing around with the idea of self-government. They want conformity. Many of them are very fine men, have a genuine regard for the welfare of the men under their care, and go to considerable lengths to help them; but they do not want any dangerous thinking aroused. Free group discussion of public affairs is definitely discouraged, lest some "radical" might have a chance to make a "subversive" speech. In one New York State camp the commanding officer asked the educational adviser to remove from the camp paper a section describing Consumers Research, for fear the district officers might consider it communistic. Last fall a new manual for instructors was put out which contains advice on how to lead group discussion away from fundamental issues. Some of the suggestions are: "Lead the discussion away from that topic," "Refuse to discuss it," "Promise to bring up the dangerous issue at some future time. This will make it possible for the instructor to secure additional information before discussing it, and it also sets up the possibility of the topic being forgotten." "A fine, realistic way," the author comments, "to deal with the important problems of our times."

As for what the military mind thinks of democracy, that is a matter of record. For four years, between 1928 and 1932, the army "Training Manual No. 2000-25" carried this definition of American democracy to hundreds of thousands of young Americans who were taking military instruction:

> "Democracy: A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of 'direct' expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude towards property is communistic—negating property rights. Attitude towards law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice and impulse, without restraint or regard for consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

That should be clear and emphatic enough without comment. Mussolini would approve of it. Hitler would consider it sound stuff.

Let us not be deceived. We are not defending ourselves. We are threatening ourselves. We are threatening our pacific relations with the rest of the world. We are threatening to undermine what freedom and democracy we have, and to change the very nature of our commonwealth into something that our tradition, experience, values and ideals detest.

*S. S. Sargent, "The Army Tries to Teach," *Christian Century*, April 15, 1936.

Citizens of the World

VIRGINIA C. GILDERSLEEVE

As I compare college students of today with those of twenty-five years and more ago, one of the most outstanding differences is the greater interest felt at present in world affairs. Even if the student of a quarter century ago felt an *interest* in other countries and in international relations, she was very unlikely to feel any *personal responsibility* for bettering the state of the world. Today, on the other hand, a considerable number of our young people feel an active interest and a direct responsibility which is sometimes rather touching.

A group of them have organized as a "Peace Action Committee." "Lots of people *talk* about Peace," said one young enthusiast to me recently, with flashing eyes, "But *we* are going to *do* something about it." "Splendid!" said I, "Do it, by all means, and blessings on you!"

In this zeal some of the students occasionally do silly and annoying things—or at least what *seems* to us silly and annoying. But as we are really responsible we ought to be patient with them. The Great War awakened in most thinking people a realization of the cruelty and the imbecility of war, and of the fact that another world war would probably mean the destruction of civilization. This feeling we began to preach, to expound, to teach, and it is a striking example of the effectiveness of such teaching that in a few years a generation grew up in the atmosphere of such beliefs —feeling instinctively that war was the final calamity and the final idiocy. Then they saw a war apparently about to break upon them, and some of them—the more imaginative and emotional—became quite desperate. I have been very much moved at times by their desperation. "We *must* do something—*anything*—to stop the world from slipping, slipping, slipping into the abyss." So they cry out.

Well, we have brought them to feel like that. So

*Dean of Barnard College, Columbia University, New York.

we must sympathize, and try to give them some outlet, and not condemn them if some of their own outlets and actions seem foolish. It is not easy to find the right outlet, the right ways of making an ardent young student feel that she *is* stopping the next war!

I myself do not approve, for example, of the so-called "Oxford Pledge." I doubt whether I should personally approve of any pledge binding me to act in a certain way in the future, under circumstances which I cannot possibly anticipate, and which may conceivably make me feel quite differently. But I could understand some individuals wanting to pledge themselves never to take any part in any war whatsoever—adopting the Quaker creed. The Oxford Pledge, however, as worded in this country, binds the taker of the oath merely not to support any war waged by the United States government. This always seems to me to imply that he rather expects to support some other kinds of war—class war, for example, waged by the Communist Party, or some similar conflict. And I think it is very unfortunate that these issues should be confused and a clear line not drawn between pacifists and non-pacifists. But I should not dream of condemning any student who, seeking some weapon to combat war picks up this one—unpractical though it may seem to me.

I question, too, the value of some of these anti-war "strikes" and demonstrations,—except that perhaps they sometimes stimulate lethargic and indifferent students to begin at least to think about world problems.

Why condemn these efforts and explosions, however, if we have brought up our students to feel this way and have not supplied them with something else to do? What have the colleges actually been offering to their students, besides condemnation of war?

My own efforts concentrated at first on helping our students to *know* the people of other nations and to understand them. That seemed to me the job peculiarly suited to the colleges, the building of that foundation of understanding on which world peace must ultimately rest. And so we have tried to provide at Barnard College many opportunities for friendly acquaintances with people of other lands.

We have had a splendid series of visiting professors from France, England, Spain, Austria, Turkey, Italy. For ten years our undergraduates have raised money for international fellowships to send Barnard students abroad and bring foreign students to Barnard. For the last two years our Trustees have offered five scholarships for foreign students each year covering room, board and tuition. And we have sent a succession of able girls to study in Geneva at the end of their Junior year.

International acquaintance is not only exciting and worth while; it is sometimes fraught with difficulties, misunderstandings and embarrassments. There have been some comical examples of what pitfalls we are led into by false ideas of foreign peoples. But on the whole we have got on excellently with our friends of other lands.

International understanding and friendship may be indeed that foundation on which the future peace must rest; but it is not enough. There must be some world order, some machinery, some philosophy of life for mankind on our lovely little planet. Most colleges, certainly Barnard, through courses in history, in government, in sociology, in international relations, in economics, in philosophy, try to stimulate their students to think on these great problems, and to supply them with enough knowledge and enough mental discipline to make their thought fairly reasonable and fruitful.

Are we really arriving anywhere in our efforts to create citizens of the world? Yes, I think we are; but the journey is a long one and our destination still wrapped in clouds. We do not know just what it will look like when we get there.

One great difficulty in our pathway is the talk of and the conception of *peace*. Peace is a poor word and a poor goal. It is a negative conception, it is not a state to appeal to the gallant spirit of youth. Moreover, it is, as a subject for discussion, the most controversial and embittering topic I know. Nothing is more effective in arousing an assemblage to belligerency than talk of peace.

Can we not find a better word to describe that friendly cooperation for human welfare which is what we are really aiming at? I have sought it in vain. But recently I heard Mr. de Madariaga give a brilliant exposition of the philosophy of our new effort for the welfare of all men on this little planet of ours, the Earth. "World spirit," he called the feeling we should strive to develop.

Among the many responsibilities of an American college today, perhaps the creation of "world spirit" in its students is one. It must be based, of course, on patriotism—patriotism of the right sort. The poor patriot is not likely to be a good citizen of the world. We must try then, to produce good Americans, taking responsibility for the welfare of their own country, and eager to have it play a noble and generous part in the life of the world. And we must stir in them the beginnings of that new world spirit which looks on mankind as one, and friendly cooperation as the remedy for its ills. Somehow, too, we must give more effectively to our young people *something to do* about it all. We must try to provide more outlets for their generous and passionate desire to help mankind. We must suggest to them causes for which, if need be, they feel willing to die. That is not easy; but Barnard will keep on seeking ways toward these ends.

We Who Would Live

They hurl these epithets at us:
Those fatuous ones, parading pompously
Or rubbing their hands behind their barricades of gold.
"Come on, and show that you're not yellow—"
They shout, but they mean: Come on and show
That you're not afraid to do our killing for us.

Yellow—cowards—pacifists—
Because we defy the blackness
Of a blind stupidity willing us
To destruction of other rainbow-hearted youth.

Because we protest the shattering
Of a gallant soul with a dream
Or the crushing of a star-quickened spirit.

We who would live abundantly—
We who thrill to surging potency of life—
We who would join the makers—
Dare with a passionate courage
To take up the challenge cast with the epithets:
"Yellow—cowards—pacifists."

DOROTHY A. LINNEY.

Sanctions and Non-Recognition

S. O. LEVINSON

First of all, it is interesting to note that the framers of the text of the Covenant of the League did not use the word "sanctions." The action taken by the League against Italy was based specifically on Article 16 which opens with:

> Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants * * * it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League which hereby undertake *immediately* to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations. * * * It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend * * * what effective military, naval, or air force the members of the League shall generally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenant of the League."

Observe that the so-called "sanctions" article does not provide that economic pressure will first be tried and that, if that fails, the armed forces of the members are then to be invoked. They are all one "set of sanctions." This is logical enough in view of the legal state of war against all members declared in the opening clause of Article 16. Now what in fact did the Council and Assembly do after the brazen heralding last October by Mussolini that Italy was proceeding to conquer Ethiopia for the frank reason that it needed the territory? The League, facing the stark violation of Article 16, while it voted "economic sanctions," dilly-dallied along for a month or two before attempting to put them into effect. Meantime, of course, by all methods of transportation, Italy filled her armories and larders. This delay of an "immediate" duty under Article 16 may well, or at least partially, explain the ineffectiveness of this first real experiment in economic sanctions.

Now what happened? Unfortunately for the League and Ethiopia, these belated measures of economic pressure did not achieve their objective. Mussolini pursued the even tenor of his planned subjugation of Ethiopia. The conquest is now a gruesome fact. It must, therefore, be admitted that the trial of sanctions in this instance did not work. Perhaps if started "immediately," more probably if accompanied or followed by "contribution to armed forces" under Article 16, the "sanctions" would have succeeded. But their purpose was to *halt* aggression, to *prevent* conquest. The experience is valuable but the purpose failed. Nowhere in Article 16 is it provided that its economic pressure shall be continued indefinitely regardless of its effect. For if it did so provide or contemplate, then it is now the plain duty of the League members not only to persist in the boycott, but to summon together their military strength and wrest from Italy the fruits of her aggression. That might precipitate a world war, and who would be insane enough to propose European suicide? Hence, it seems clear that the function of economic sanctions is dead. For even the continuance of economic pressure can now only be justified as a punishment, an economic punitive expedition conducted from afar under which many millions of innocent people may suffer, and out of which the grim visage of Mars may again emerge.

As much as I have abhorred the brutal attack of Italy upon a weak and hapless nation, the logic and common sense of the present situation call for the abatement and withdrawal of sanctions. Then the League must decide whether to retain the policy of sanctions and to go their full limit under Article 16, or to amend the Covenant by eliminating sanctions altogether as impracticable. The horns of that dilemma are indeed impaled upon the League.

But the question of non-recognition is entirely another matter. Involved therein is the highest possible moral and practical problem for all the nations, in or outside the League. For if the conquest of Ethiopia by Italian aggression is to be recognized because it is a fait accompli, then the old doctrine that might creates right is full upon us. If we recognize, we condone; if we condone, in effect we put our affirmative blessing on aggression. In this question all non-League members should be as vitally interested as the League itself. The conclusion is inescapable that if we recognize the conquest of Ethiopia, we must recognize any and all other successful aggressions in the future. We certainly cannot pick and choose our recognitions of aggressions. With rumors and alarums of war filling the atmosphere of Europe, such a commitment would nullify the pact of Paris and would make a mockery of justice, international law, and peace.

Only Son

The country lost a soldier,
A father lost a son,
But I'm the boy's own mother
And I've lost EVERY ONE.

I've lost the child I held in arms,
The toddler at my knee.
The school-boy with his eager mind
Who used to dream with me.

I've lost the lover who brought flowers
In every month of May,
The son who always paid me court
On happy Mother's Day.

I've lost the man who would have brought
A daughter unto me.
Lost too the father before he laid
My grandchild on my knee.

The country gave a soldier
When my son went oversea
But I gave to war every treasure
That life had promised me.

MOLLY MARR SCHULTZ.

An Excursion Into the Southland

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The invitation to deliver the annual Baccalaureate Sermon at Atlanta University and its affiliate institutions, Morehouse and Spelman Colleges, was welcome. I had visited these Negro halls of learning before, and had had the pleasure of addressing a great audience in Sisters Chapel at Spelman on this occasion. Now came the chance to participate in the Commencement, and I was glad.

The railway journey to Atlanta was hot and dirty. A drought of more than sixty days' duration had stricken the southern countryside, and the air was full of dust blown from the parched fields and withered crops. On the very Sunday of my visit, Governor Talmadge, of Georgia, had ordered prayers for rain, in all the churches, and when black storm clouds threatened in the afternoon, one friend at least was disturbed lest, in spite of all the need for water, the political prestige of Talmadge be magnified by a deluge following upon official petitions at the throne of Grace! A poor countryside looked poorer than ever beneath the blasting sun—a neglected or ill-cultivated region. There was no surplus of crops in this part of the country! "I have always wondered," said a visitor at the Commencement, "how Sherman's army ever managed to live off the country when it marched from Atlanta to the sea."

A cordial welcome at the station from Florence Read, President of Spelman College, first known to me years ago at Reed College in Portland, Oregon, was followed by a short ride to the campus through the cool of the Saturday evening, for Atlanta is a thousand feet above sea level, and thus as temperate in the hot months of the year as many a northern city. In the morning (Sunday), there was a bright sun in a cloudless sky, but fresh breezes were stirring the air, and there was ample time to do some sightseeing before dinner and the Baccalaureate Service at 3 P. M. So off we went!

First, a drive through some of the Negro residential districts, scattered in several different parts of the city! We saw the two extremes—the best and the worst. The best Negro sections are as attractive as any white suburban areas in the North, and on the whole much better than any such Negro areas. The prosperous and cultured Negro in the South, in other words, has a better chance of securing good living conditions than his compeer north of Mason and Dixon's line. In the North this type of Negro must break into some white neighborhood, if he is to find a decent home, and therewith encounter the danger of the well-known Dr. Sweet of Detroit. But in the South there are entire Negro districts, like this one which we were seeing, where comfort and convenience, refinement and beauty prevail. Many of the houses in this Atlanta area were of fine architectural design, set amid pleasant lawns and trees and flower-beds. Some few of the houses were large and elaborate in style, but all in excellent taste. They ran on, these houses, block after block—every now and then, however, curiously interrupted by a shack or two, a cheap grocery store, or a shabby church. Twice I saw superb modern school buildings for Negro children, one of these the famous Booker T. Washington High School, with the great bronze statue of the Black Emancipator at the imposing entrance.

But in contrast with the best in Atlanta housing for Negroes, there is also the worst. Acres and acres of ramshackle wooden hovels, perched aloft on precarious timber or brick piles, without foundations and cellars! Unpainted, unrepaired, dirty, these houses, I was told, had many of them no running water for the use of tenants and no toilet facilities except the most primitive. Atlanta is one of the proudest, most prosperous, and most progressive of southern cities, and also one of the most intelligent, and yet within a stone's throw of the new Atlanta University and within a mile of the business center, I saw Negro homes, so-called, which would have disgraced an Alabama plantation. Just as in New York, the vilest tenements can be found within four or five blocks of Broadway!

Right in the midst of one of these Negro slum districts is a government housing project of remarkable proportions and design. About two years ago, the Washington administration purchased outright a wide stretch of land, and stripped it clean of the miserable hovels which sheltered a swarming Negro population. Then came the development, now reaching its first stage of completion. Over all this area were erected neat two-story brick houses, offering accommodations for something over six hundred Negro families. Each apartment has a separate entrance, securing privacy, and of course is equipped with the most modern toilet and housekeeping arrangements. The grading and landscaping of the neighborhood have still to be done, but already there are abundant signs of beauty and convenience combined in the service of human welfare. But who is going to live in these new buildings? That depends on rents—whether they are reckoned on capital invested, or on consumers' capacity to pay. If the latter, then this development will serve the poor whom it was meant to serve; if the former, then one more model housing project will fall into the hands of the moderately well-to-do, who should be able to take care of themselves. And whoever comes here, what is going to be their relations with the slum-dwellers who ring them 'round on every side? I can see this housing area in the future as a fair city besieged by the barbarians. "There'll be civil war here some day," said a housing expert to me, forebodingly.

There was still time to see the University and the Colleges—Atlanta, Spelman and Morehouse. The union of these three institutions into what is called "the Atlanta University System" seems to me to be one of the most remarkable feats of educational statesmanship in recent American history. Originally, of course, the three were entirely separate in their work as in their origin. Atlanta had claims to university rating, but conducted undergraduate studies in direct competition with Morehouse, a college for men, and with Spelman, the first college in this country exclusively for Negro women, both located on practically adjacent campuses. This seemed wasteful, and *was* wasteful. Proposals for affiliation, or even cooperation, were blocked by student rivalries, alumni jealousies, endowment difficulties, and the dead hand of long-established tradition. But wisdom and determination were at work, and seven years

ago the union of the three institutions was consummated. Morehouse College is now the undergraduate college for men, and Spelman the undergraduate college for women, while Atlanta, discontinuing its undergraduate departments after sixty years of history, functions exclusively as a co-educational graduate institution. Endowments remain separate, but faculties are merged, and the three libraries combined into a new university library of more than 50,000 volumes. To signalize and properly equip the amalgamation, three splendid new buildings have been erected in strategic positions for uniting the three institutions. These are the Administration Building, the University Library, and the Atlanta University dormitories for men and women. The three campuses, now in reality a single campus, occupy some of the highest points of land in the city. They cover in all ninety-three acres of ground, on which are located twenty-eight buildings for classroom or housing purposes.

If this work of unification is the achievement of any one man, that man is Dr. John Hope, for more than a quarter of a century the President of Morehouse College, and chosen by unanimous consent to be President of Atlanta University and the head of the "System" when the new era was begun. Dr. Hope, who died tragically last February, lived long enough to see the triumph of what many regarded in the beginning as a hazardous experiment, and which now has become his own enduring memorial. He caught the vision from the beginning, and worked for its realization with infinite patience, tact and resolution. As one looks down from his office window upon his grave, most appropriately placed at the very heart of the new campus, one feels the abiding presence of a man brave, gentle, wise, and utterly devoted, who created out of his very life the most important center of Negro education in America.

At the Baccalaureate Service in the afternoon, nothing was more impressive than the fact that it was a joint ceremony, in which all three institutions united. The service was held in Sisters Chapel of Spelman, because this was the largest and most beautiful auditorium on the common campus. The academic procession was led by the students, men and women, graduating from Atlanta University. After these came the seniors of Morehouse and of Spelman, a Morehouse man in each case side by side with a Spelman woman. Then followed the faculty, or faculties, with the Presidents and invited guests bringing up the rear. At the great organ, which pealed out the Triumphant March from Verdi's *Aida,* sat the Professor of Music at the three institutions. The anthems, Mendelssohn's "Come, Let Us Sing to the Lord," and Balakirew's "Send Forth Thy Light," were sung by the Atlanta-Morehouse-Spelman Chorus. It was all a common effort to a common end in a common spirit of dedication.

In the Chapel as we entered, occupying more than two-thirds of the pews, were already assembled a great company of parents, friends, and citizens of Atlanta. Gay colors in the summer dresses and hats contrasted with the dark faces and the black gowns of the graduating students. Here and there were whites, but they were very few. Could these have been more than a dozen, or perhaps at most a score? No, this was a Negro audience—and a Negro audience at its very best of refinement, culture, and intelligence. For the first time at such an occasion in my experience, this was an audience which was asked not merely to listen but to participate. For when the Spirituals were sung —"Every Time I Feel the Spirit," and "Great Day, the Righteous Marching"—the musical director faced the gathering, and congregation lifted their voices with choir. These Spirituals were of course the high-water mark of the service. The supreme and unique contribution of the Negro race not merely to America but to the world, their rendition by Negro singers, especially by the Negro people gathered on an occasion of this kind and singing from the heart, is always a thing of wonder. Invariably it shakes me as the wind shakes the leaves of a tree.

Leaving Atlanta on an early evening train, I passed a porter as I made my way to the club car.

"Good evening, Reverend," was his greeting, as his black face shone with friendliness.

"Why, good evening," I replied.

"O, yes, sir, I know you," he cried, with a gleaming smile, catching on the instant my confusion. "You see, I was up to the college this afternoon, and I heard you preach."

"Well, that's nice. Thanks very much."

"O, yes, sir, I always go. Never miss a Baccalaureate at Spelman if my train's in town! I'll be back here Wednesday, in time to take in the Spelman Commencement."

"It's a great place up there."

"O, yes, sir. Wonderful since they got those colleges together! Nothing like it now anywhere else. I go up there whenever I can—lectures, and concerts, and these commencements. Glad to see you, Reverend! And glad to hear you!"

I took my seat in the club car, and tried to read my copy of Zweig's *Mary, Queen of Scotland and the Isles,* but it seemed very far away. Just beyond me were two men vigorously debating the New Deal. From two other men across the aisle I caught drifting phrases —"purchasing power," "the consumer," "raising the price level," "new taxes," etc., etc. I was going to hear the same talk on the trip north that I had heard interminably on the trip south. What a change in this —our time—that everybody now talks economics, and to some extent or other is an expert in the field! But I kept thinking of other things. In my mind's eye was the picture of a people risen from slavery and marching painfully but surely through every difficulty to triumph. In the light of such an achievement, how can we feel despair? What this portion of the race has done we can all do, and thus in due time conquer even war and poverty, and establish at last the commonwealth of man.

We Believe

Nobler the austere face of toil
Than the suave perfumed smirk
Of speculation's darlingest,
All combed and oiled—
The perfect shirk.

Better to see the knuckles
Work-stiff and gnarled,
Than hear the easy chuckles
Of ethics snarled.

ALICE FERRIN HENSEY.

The Study Table

A New Biography of Theodore Parker

THEODORE PARKER, YANKEE CRUSADER. *By Henry Steele Commager. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. $3.00.*

Among the band of rugged idealists who made pre-Civil War New England a hot-bed for the nurturing of brave and sweeping plans for the reformation and regeneration of the world, Theodore Parker remains a curiously neglected figure. After his death there appeared a biography by his friend and fellow-Unitarian minister, John Weiss, one of those ponderous affairs peculiar to the period which juggled and edited facts to fit the biographer's design to make his subject of heroic stature. Many years later came conventional but far more accurate studies by Octavius Frothingham, the historian of the transcendentalist movement, and by John White Chadwick, another Unitarian minister; and there have been other biographies of less importance. Parker does not, therefore, want for interpreters; but he still lacks recognition in history as one of the important figures of the American scene of the 1840's and 1850's—a strenuous preacher of most of the reforms which have become commonplaces of our day, and, perhaps more important, a man who stands out among his harsh and fanatical contemporaries as that *rara avis,* an individual on fire to change the world who was also an appealing human being.

Henry Steele Commager in the present book has attempted to fill the void and restore Parker to his rightful importance. It should be said at once that within the limitations he has set for himself he has succeeded admirably in his task. He relates faithfully and accurately the salient points in a fascinating life; we follow Parker from his birth on a harsh and rocky Lexington farm down through the years, touching on his prodigious struggle for an education, his position as a heretic and outcast from the correct and timid religious society of Boston, his plunge into the turbulent waters of social reform, and finally the tragedy of his premature death at the age of forty-nine. In the course of the story we are introduced not only to an alluring gallery of contemporaries but to a whole society, and Mr. Commager tries scrupulously to establish the proper relationships. When he attempts to define Parker's significance I think he places emphasis in the right places. It seems to me especially valuable to have his full treatment of Parker's religious position, for, while he was a dabbler and in no sense an originator in social reform, he was in the field of religion a pioneer who may be said to be the father of liberal Christianity in America.

The book thus has its virtues, yet it seems to me to fail curiously as the portrait of a man. As I have said, within self-imposed limitations, as noted in the Preface, Mr. Commager has done a splendid job; he has recorded faithfully the writings and conversations of Parker and his friends and enemies and has succeeded in producing from these the picture of a personality of sorts. But it is a tantalizingly one-sided picture, the sort any man could paint if he had the patience to read Parker's voluminous writings, the memoirs of his friends, and the contemporary journals and newspapers; it is in the main the picture of a public figure *as* a public figure. It is enlightening to know what Parker said from the pulpit and in public meetings but this is not the essential Parker. What we want to know is what sort of a man he was when he stepped out of the role of public figure into private life—assuming that he had a life outside the pulpit and the lecture platform. My complaint would be that Mr. Commager gives us only the merest scraps of the details of such a private life. His marriage, for instance, is treated in the barest fashion and we lay down the book without ever having learned what sort of a person Lydia Parker really was. And what about Hannah Stevenson who came to live in the intimate circle of family life with the Parkers—what was she like and, more important, what was her relationship to Theodore Parker? Surely there must be material available that would enable the biographer to make fuller characterizations of these two women who had such a strong influence on the preacher.

But even in his treatment of Parker as a public figure he does not always bring him to life. He does not tell us, for example, what kind of an audience it was that flocked by the thousands to the Music Hall to hear Parker, or attempt to describe in any detail the tremendous emotional stirring the preacher must on many occasions have aroused in that audience. Nowhere does he give us a vivid picture of Parker in action. Some of those abolitionist meetings when Parker thundered against the intrenched power of the time in an atmosphere of tense expectancy must have been tremendous experiences for the spectators; a dramatist could make them glow and pulsate with life for contemporary readers. A biographer of Parker needs to get some of the turbulence of the preacher's own life in his writing.

Mr. Commager's book raises an interesting point in biographical technique. I take it that he more or less accepts the dictum of Henry Adams that in a biography only the known facts should be stated and that the best life of a man is the record of his own words. I can appreciate such a position, but is there not a point where the biographer, confronted with his mass of known facts, must venture into the realm of interpretation and speculation if he would create a living portrait rather than a merely conventional review of a life? One of the greatest of modern biographies is a book much criticized because of its author's freedom in going beyond facts in his drawing of character—yet Mr. Strachey's life of Victoria is the only one which makes her live in the mind of the reader. If Mr. Commager had been a little less determined to stick to the record, I think he would have written a better book.

There are a few errors in the text such as his reference to E. H. Chapin, the Universalist preacher, as E. H. Chaplin; and I would like to know to whom he refers when he speaks of Parker hearing Fox preach in England in 1843. George Fox, the Quaker preacher, had been dead for a hundred and fifty years. I would like also to know more about Sheba Smith, the woman preacher who occupied Parker's pulpit; can it be that Mr. Commager is talking about Seba Smith, the husband of Elizabeth Oakes Smith and a prominent advocate of women's rights?

MORTIMER B. SMITH.

Imperial Hearst

HEARST, LORD OF SAN SIMEON. *By Oliver Carlson and E. S. Bates. 312 pp. New York: The Viking Press. $3.00.*

IMPERIAL HEARST. *By Ferdinand Lundberg. 381 pp. New York: Equinox Cooperative Press. $2.75.*

We are momentarily tempted to believe it would be more than worth while if by a temporary dictatorship of a month one could compel every adult citizen to read and be examined in these two unauthorized biographies of William Randolph Hearst.

Hearst, the spoiled boy, thrown out of Harvard for an insulting trick on his professors, given by his father, George Hearst, the San Francisco *Examiner,* begins the career that has proved the most disastrous ever known to America's welfare. Teaching his newspaper men to make the news sensational with little or no regard for the facts, Hearst almost single-handed brought on the Spanish-American War to his own financial profit, for the circulation of the New York *Journal* leaped from 100,000 to the million mark. Mr. Lundberg wonders if Hearst had any connection with the explosion on the Maine, which so incensed the nation to Hearst's benefit, and asks, "Might not the directing intelligence behind the posting of provocative placards in post-war Havana be considered in connection with the 'incident' in Havana Harbor on the night of February 15, 1898? (p. 82.)

Hearst's perennial attempts to get elected to something, all the way from Mayor of New York to President of the United States, (he was elected to Congress with Tammany assistance); the use of his great wealth to buy up newspapers until 40 per cent of the newspaper readers today peruse Hearst papers; his "fake" correspondents during the World War that he could not direct; his attempts to involve America in wars with Japan, Mexico, Great Britain; his publication of the fraudulent Mexican "documents," as revealed to a Committee of the United States Senate, charging five honored United States Senators with receiving bribes to sell their country to Mexico, all the charges being proved absolutely false; the complicity, as charged by President Theodore Roosevelt, of Hearst in the assassination of President McKinley; his responsibility for the thug "wars" in Chicago; why Royal S. Copeland is now United States Senator from New York—these and a thousand other startling revelations about this Fascist spear-head in America are treated thrillingly in both volumes.

Hearst, Lord of San Simeon, is perhaps a little more popularly written; and, while thoroughly documented of course, as a rule does not give as much documentation as *Imperial Hearst.* The latter carries the story even down to 1936! Hearst's sudden fondness for Hitler and his apparent determination to transform America into a Fascist country are more thoroughly set forth in *Imperial Hearst,* while the personal habits of Hearst at San Simeon, with Marion Davies assisting, are treated more in detail in *Hearst, Lord of San Simeon.*

Of course, as Charles A. Beard reminds us in the Preface to Mr. Lundberg's book, "This is not to say that Hearst possesses no virtues. Nero and Caligula had virtues." Strangely, Mr. Hearst saw through the "Allied" propaganda that hurled America into the maelstrom of the World War, and published as fine a statement about the Wall street brigands that involved us in that disastrous affair as anyone could. However, as our authors prove, he acted as he did solely for his own interests in Peru and Wall Street. So, too, with regard to his early enthusiasm for the Soviets of Russia! Today, however, he has so far recovered from his schizophrenia that he finds his real interests coincide with those of Hitler and Mussolini, even though the latter spurned him. Bibliographies and indices in both volumes add to their value. Both are books for the genuine lover of America, that he may be forearmed against the wiles of this patriot for profit!

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Veblen

THORSTEIN VEBLEN AND HIS AMERICA. *By Joseph Dorfman. 556 pp. New York: The Viking Press.*

Many circumstances conspired to concentrate upon the person of Thorstein Veblen the attentive interest which quickened general appreciation during his declining years and elaborated the Veblen legend since his death in 1929. Veblen displayed great intellectual competence as a critic of the orthodox economics of his day, and this alone, uncombined with the special flavor of his personality, might have won him fame, but never reverence.

Part of the secret of the Veblen aura was his neglect of the lower expediencies of practical life. Veblen got far enough in accredited university centers to establish connections with influential figures, and to compel the notice of students and colleagues. But he combined this with varieties of negligence which expressed some inability or some deep unwillingness to fit into the accepted order. Men (or women) who admired his gifted irony were apt to be men sharp enough to see the point of what he said, and restive enough to relish a pot-shot at authority. Even those among the Veblenites who kept sufficient contact with mundane reality to depend upon themselves were sufficiently full of resentment against reality to idealize an iconoclast who failed to conform, and who, it may be added, dropped out of immediate competition with them.

The semi-iconoclasts were sufficiently prudent to do the petty lobbying which establishes friendly connections with the "right" people. Veblen did not lobby the trustees or the personages of the community. At the very least he might have courted favor among the masses, the students. But Veblen affected a bearing of great disinterestedness, and used an exasperatingly low voice. He catered to a limited few who were seduced at least by his humor, detachment, whimsicality, and luminosity.

Here, then, was a person who lacked "punch" and who omitted "contacts." He contravened the simple conveniences of ordinary survival. Hence he was eligible to stand for the role of hero in any epic of rejection of bourgeois cautiousness in American life; and especially in American university life, where intellectuality was so often a trade, a way of making a living, rather than an ornament, a luxury, or a sacrament. Here was a first-class mind who refused to compete in the ordinary sense of the word, who was constantly on the charity of his friends, a little pathetic, a little heroic, and unmistakably out of the ordinary.

Dr. Dorfman, with no doubt pardonable solemnity, has industriously collected the more obvious sorts of data about his subject. His book is far more distinguished as a lexicon of reference than as a biography, or as a contribution to the analysis of intellectuals. He paraphrases the output of Veblen with sufficient detail to tire the laymen, and insufficient precision to suit the researcher. Veblen's personality is handled neither with

the perspicacity of the poet nor the clarity of the scientist.

Out of this quite un-Veblenian warehouse it is possible to extract objects of great utility in connecting Veblen with Veblen and with his environment. Veblen displays one great thematic unity through all the apparent tergiversations of his thought. To the public at large this can be conveyed by saying he is concerned with the antinomy of use and profit. This is the point of the contrast between engineer and entrepreneur which was the basis of posthumous notoriety in connection with Technocracy.

Veblen was preoccupied with the sweep of changing forms of control at a time when American economics was taken up with more careful statements of "equilibrium." In this sense Veblen was an "institutionalist"; he was preoccupied with development. Part of his fame rests upon the oblique moralism of his speech. For Veblen chose moralizing words and soberly insisted that they should be treated as non-invidious categories. This trick furthered his popularity with the "radicals" and contributed to the penumbra of admiration with which his receding figure is quite properly panoplied.

HAROLD D. LASSWELL.

The University of Chicago.

American Letters

A HISTORY OF AMERICAN LETTERS. *By Walter Fuller Taylor. 678 pp. New York: American Book Company.*

One of the most significant signs of the time is the renewed interest in American letters. The present volume is a worthy contribution to the cause. Written by Professor Taylor of Mississippi College, it is one of the series in American literature under the general editorship of Professor Harry Hayden Clark of the University of Wisconsin. The bibliographies which comprise the last third of the book were prepared by Harry Hartwick and give all the important books and articles dealing with the subject to date.

Professor Taylor has divided his history into five parts. Part one: the seventeenth century gives a brief summary of the Puritan background. Part two: the eighteenth century carries the story through Edwards, Franklin, Paine down to Charles Brockden Brown. Parts three and four: the nineteenth century passes from the resumé stage to a definite grapple with the subject. The discussion of Melville is especially good and brings out hitherto neglected aspects of his thought. For example, most works on American letters pass by the development of the missionary enterprise so characteristic of the nineteenth century. Melville observed this movement. "For the missionaries [so Melville felt], while professing to introduce to the heathen the compassionate and blameless Christ, had in reality introduced the European freebooter, who sowed venereal diseases among the natives and civilized them into draft horses to do his work." The truth is, of course, that "the European freebooter" followed the missionary and almost undid what good the missionary was able to accomplish. But this should not be omitted from a history of American letters. The nineteenth century also saw the romantic movement in religion, Unitarianism, with its emphasis on the essential goodness of human nature. The slavery question, the development of the scientific outlook, etc., all receive a capable treatment. Part five: the twentieth century is, however, the best part of the book. Here is an excellent treatment of the machine age with all its baneful influences. But here, too, are Frost, Robinson, Wharton, Cather, Dreiser, Lewis, Lindsay, and all the rest. The criticism of Sinclair Lewis is especially trenchant.

Everyone interested in the pageant of America would do well to have this book at hand as a guide not only to the past but to the present and future.

CHARLES ARTHUR HAWLEY.

The State University of Iowa.

Correspondence

How to Get Good Citizens

Editor of UNITY:

Ever since man chipped flints and used a few articulate sounds as symbols of an idea, man's progress has followed two parallel lines—one, the mastery over nature; the other, mastery over himself and his fellows. While he was inventing arrows and boats and learning to make fire and wheels, he was also developing language, religion, art and government. Side by side, keeping pace with each other, these lines proceeded, bringing in the same century the use of gunpowder and the opening of the New World, while the second line proportionately advanced when "Gutenberg made thought cosmopolite." Not until about the time of our Declaration of Independence, when the industrial revolution began to harness the elemental forces and multiply production beyond the wildest dreams of previous days, did these two lines show signs of parting company. Today the mastery over the material world has performed miracles in the gain in speed and wealth and force—the three things on which the last hundred years have laid increasing attention.

The age of homespun in America was an age of genius in the realms of statesmanship. America marked out untrodden paths and by a federated United States showed Europe how to have a peaceful and federated world. It is now fifty years since great new geniuses in statesmanship have appeared. The present generation knows not the inspiration of living in a world in which one might be surprised any day by reading an inspiring poem from Tennyson, Browning, Longfellow or Whittier, or an essay from Emerson, Carlyle or Ruskin, or the report of an address by Gladstone, Sumner, Agassiz or Darwin. Our surprises if they are pleasant come from the laboratory or from archaeological excavations, or from exploits like those of Lindbergh or Byrd.

We who incited other nations to try democracy not only have not yet mastered it ourselves, but are seeing our voters more confused and bewildered and skeptical than at any time since the Civil War. The higher lessons of government, also, whether in nation, state, or city, have lately had few contributions from our country, while inventiveness in everything which pertains to material progress and the accumulation of private wealth has been phenomenal. The great advances in penal and charitable measures which marked the progress of the nineteenth century, the toleration and education which have in a measure metamorphosed our attitude towards our fellowmen, how-

ever admirable, are incommensurate with the astounding progress which in material matters have obscured progress and left us complacent. This is not due to people of foreign birth. The worst ballot box stuffing, and the largest death roll of victims of civic misrule have been in the city which had the largest American population.

It is surprisingly evident that the terms "educated man," and "good man" are not symonymous with "good citizen." Thirty years ago most educators seemed to fancy that teaching civics merely involved instruction about the nation, state and city officers and in teaching salute to the flag. Since the moral and mental decadence following the World War, we recognize the force of President Nicholas Murray Butler's *Decline and Fall of Morals*. Beneath the problems of crime, slum clearance, abolition of capitalism and all the questions of obtaining raw materials and ending unearned wealth is that of getting clear insight and following the Golden Rule. Most political and economic questions, high tariffs, dictatorships and a cursed narrow nationalism would end were the deep-rooted psychical and ethical forces in right control of sane voters and patriots.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Brookline, Massachusetts.

Inflation and Wages

Editor of UNITY:

We meet people continually who frighten themselves and others over "inflation." As a means of inciting the jitters, this term is quite as effective as that hard-worked bogey, "bolshevism." Polls have been taken recently to learn how voters stand on the question. But if the results of all the polls were averaged, it would give us little light; for the questionnaires seldom tell just what they mean by inflation.

To most people it seems to mean any method of raising prices. We are warned that inflation is always bad for the wage-earner because "wages never rise as fast as prices." That assertion has been repeated so often that apparently it has come to be accepted without investigation by people who are usually careful in what they say.

Here we have Prof. Maynard Kreuger of the University of Chicago saying: "There is one thing that has been true of wage rates in every country in which there has been inflation. That is, that when prices go up they go up in the elevator while wages climb the stairs." And Congressman Thomas R. Amlie in his *Forgotten Man's Handbook* says: "Inflation always drives down labor income to unprecedented low levels, because wage increases always lag behind prices." Many similar statements could be quoted, both from friends of the wage-earner and from spokesmen for the vested interests.

We need to discriminate. Students of the history of wages have found that rising prices have proved disastrous for the wage-earners and for most other classes when the rise was due to large issues of irredeemable paper money. When the rise has resulted from an increasing world production of gold (or of silver under bimetallism) the wage-earner has benefited. There are reasons for these results, but space will not permit discussion of them here. It can be said that moderate issues of irredeemable currency are not necessarily injurious. Often they would be beneficial except for the fear that they will be followed by larger issues.

No greater gain in real wages (purchasing power) has ever come to workers in America than during the period 1896-1926. Prof. Paul Douglas' exhaustive volume on wages, covering this period, shows that from 1896 to 1914 the index for purchasing power of wages in all U. S. industries rose from 92 to 100, and during the years 1922-26 purchasing power rose from 116 to 127. Even in the abnormal war period there was a slight increase in purchasing power for industrial wages and a great increase for farm wages. These gains were achieved under rising prices while we were on the gold standard, but similar facts can be given for earlier periods of rising prices under bimetallism.

These gains were made in spite of the unreasonable boosting of prices in certain monopolized industries. Monopoly is one of the problems that must be solved before we can look very hopefully into the future. But that question should not be confused with the question of the economic effects of rising prices when these come from increased production of the precious metals.

F. S. KINDER.

Denver, Colo.

Help Our Drive for More Readers of UNITY

By securing at least one new subscriber within the next thirty days!

Use the attached form.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No. .....

City ..... State .....

$3.00 for a year's subscription.
($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries.)

☐ Remittance enclosed.
☐ Send invoice.

The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy

By Charles S. Johnson
Edwin R. Embree
W. W. Alexander

●

A copy of this significant and authoritative study of cotton tenancy in the South will be sent free to each new subscriber of UNITY; also free copies will be sent to old subscribers upon receipt of 10 cents to cover postage.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 162)

Conference of Christian Pacifists, Cambridge, England, July 28-August 4, 1936

The Fellowship of Reconciliation, acting through both its International and its British organizations, with the help of the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups, is proposing to hold an international conference of Christian Pacifists at Selwyn College, Cambridge, England, from the 28th of July to the 4th of August, 1936.

The general subject of the Conference is to be *CHRIST AND THE PEACE OF THE WORLD,* and the syllabus of lectures and discussions will attempt to cover the personal and corporate service, spiritual and practical, that Christians can render both through the Church and in other ways to resolve some of the psychological, economic and political conflicts which are burdening and destroying this present age.

It is hoped that the Conference will draw together leading Christian pacifists from a very large number of countries, that it will afford an opportunity for common testimony as well as for mutual counsel, and that through prayer and discussion members of different nationalities and communions may see light upon the way in which the Christian spirit may bring its own characteristic influence to bear on the conflicts of classes, nations and races. Those who are promoting the conference believe that in Christianity alone, that is to say only in the things that are made known to us in the life and death of Jesus Christ, is to be found solution of the conflict that man wages against man and the basis of right social and political relations. They believe, moreover, that in communion together Christians of widely sundered views may be led *of* the Spirit to make some definite and constructive contribution to peace-making in the affairs of the world.

The list of speakers and the detailed syllabus of discussions leave no doubt that the program which has been prepared will enable those who gather at least to think more deeply upon the things that belong unto peace.

An attempt will be made to afford some financial assistance to those traveling long distances who may need help.

Communications regarding the Conference, including applications for places and suggestions as to the program, may be addressed either to M. Henri Roser, Secretary of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, 11, rue de Provence, Paris 9me., or to Percy W. Bartlett, Secretary of the British Fellowship of Reconciliation, 17, Red Lion Square, London, W. C. 1.

Bureau of Research and Documentation

At the present time there are in Paris a great many university men who have left dictatorial countries for reasons which do honor to their character. Trained in scholarly research, they are in a position to collect from the libraries, archives, and museums of Paris and the French provinces much material which scholars of other countries would be unable to obtain except at the expenditure of much time and money.

Accordingly, a group of exiled scholars has decided to form a Bureau of Research and Documentation, which will offer its services to scholars outside of France for research in historical, economic, juridical, artistic, literary, scientific and philosophical fields.

The Bureau has research correspondents outside of France. It also offers to assist in the buying of books and act as a general intermediary in intellectual activities between scholars.

The undersigned call your attention to this new institution, which may prove immensely valuable to scholars.

MAX ASCOLI, Graduate Faculty of Political Science, New York;
G. A. BORGESE, Smith College;
GERARD COLM, Graduate Faculty of Political Science, New York;
ALBERT EINSTEIN, Institute of Advanced Studies, Princeton;
ARTHUR FEILER, Graduate Faculty of Political Science, New York;
GUIDO FERRANDO, Vassar College;
GUGLIELMO FERRERO, Institut des Hautes Etudes Internationales, Geneva;
MORITZ A. GEIGER, Vassar College;
EDUARD HEIDMANN, Graduate Faculty of Political Science, New York;
OSCAR JASZI, Oberlin College;
GEORGE LA PIANA, Harvard University;
EMIL LEDERER, Graduate Faculty of Political Science, New York;
GAETANO SALVEMINI, Harvard University;
CARLO SFORZA, Member of the Directing European Board of the Carnegie Endowment, Bruxelles;
HANS STAUDINGER, Graduate Faculty of Political Science, New York;
LIONELLO VENTURI, Formerly Professor of History of Art at the University of Turin, Paris;
FRIEDA WUNDERLICH, Graduate Faculty of Political Science, New York.

Communications may be addressed to Dr. V. Modigliani, Secretary of the Bureau of Research and Documentation, 8 Boulevard Ornano, Paris (XVIII), France.

Planks on Peace Approved by the National Peace Conference

The purpose of government in a democracy is the welfare of the people. The promotion of the welfare of the people requires today the maintenance of peace. War destroys the fundamental liberties upon which democratic government itself rests, and brings in its wake economic disaster to all groups. The maintenance of peace must, therefore, be the first concern of government, and its foreign policies must be in harmony with this end.

1. Economic Policies, Tariff and Trade

We urge continuation of the program of reciprocal trade agreements as an effective means for achieving the reduction of tariff barriers and other obstacles to world trade, and we strongly support all efforts on the part of our government to combat the destructive forces of economic nationalism which constitute a threat to the preservation of peace through the world.

We favor cooperation with other nations for the stabilization of currency.

The United States should cooperate with other nations through continued membership in the International Labor Organization and in other ways to raise the standard of living and to assist in solving pressing economic and social problems.

2. National Defense

We strongly condemn the alarming increase in military and naval expenditure, which now exceeds one billion dollars annually, for armed forces which cannot be justified except for use in future overseas wars. The national defense policy of the United States should be shaped on the basis of the defense of our soil, and the army and navy should be limited and organized in accordance with this conception.

The United States should increase its efforts to achieve limitation and reduction of arma-

ments on land, sea and air by international agreement.

We advocate control of the munition industry through both national and international action to prevent rivalry in armaments and to take the profit out of war and the preparation for war.

3. Neutrality Legislation

We favor the extension of existing neutrality legislation to include an embargo on supplementary war material in order that the risk of entanglement in foreign wars may be reduced, and in order that the United States may not obstruct the world community in its efforts to maintain peace.

4. International Cooperation

We reaffirm our support of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which must be maintained as the fundamental principle of American foreign policy. In the event of a violation or threatened violation of the Pact the United States should consult with the other signatories.

We advocate active and persistent steps by our government to resolve international differences in the Far East by friendly and non-warlike means.

We call upon both political parties to carry out their repeated pledges supporting American adherence to the World Court. We demand prompt action at the coming session of Congress to uphold the established policy of the United States to settle international disputes by pacific means.

We support continued cooperation with the League of Nations in all its social, economic and humanitarian activities and in its efforts to remove the causes of war.

—*Chicago Peace Council.*

Has Military Training Real Educational Value?

Prominent educators agree that military training has no true educational value for adolescents. Military drill and tactics, and military psychology in general, emphasize nonquestioning loyalty, and an obedience, which comes automatically on demand. Boys and girls in their teens, just beginning to notice social trends, should be helped by their teachers to understand these trends and to prepare themselves to assume their share of responsibility for creating just and peaceful relations between individuals and nations.

The following statements are from well known educators on the lack of educational value in military training for high school students:

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK, *Columbia University*

Military training in the public school is bad chiefly for the dignity and importance which it tends to give in the minds of pupils and citizens to war as a social agency. This result in the degree it is achieved will have the further bad effect of strengthening the military lobby in Congress, already now dangerously powerful. Besides these the time given to such training is largely wasted. The citizenship and moral training claimed by some to come from it, is on the whole rather bad than good. The citizenship so taught tends to be uncritical nationalism, and the moral character tends to reduce itself to habits of uncritical obedience to authority. Neither of these is, under present conditions, desirable. Moreover, the physical exercise supposed to be got is inferior to what is otherwise easily available. For all these reasons military training should be excluded from secondary education.

V. T. THAYER, *Director, Ethical Culture Schools*

Both the theory and the practice of education in recent years have centered upon the progressive development of the individual in the way of self-directive thought and action as a distinguishing characteristic of healthy learning. The progressive school seeks to help children and young people acquire methods of work that lead them to grow in knowledge, social attitude and dispositions, and in the use of skills and techniques through their own self-directive efforts. Sound educational procedure thus conflicts both with the philosophy and the method of military training. Military training exalts obedience and discipline as ends in themselves. The trained soldier obeys, and obeys instantly, without reference to the reason that may lie back of the command. While this may be necessary and inevitable in a state of war, it has no place as an integral part of the education of adolescents. Indeed, as we have indicated in our first sentences, it is anti-educational.

Nor can much be said on behalf of the physical advantages of military training. These are far better secured from a sound program of physical and health education.

For these reasons, together with the fact that the military point of view and the ideals commonly associated with military training are inherently anti-democratic, I have no hesitancy in stating that it has no place in our secondary schools.

PHILIP W. L. COX, *New York University*

Citizenship and character education in terms of military patterns are of value chiefly in a society of compulsions and force and are in direct conflict with the aspirations and practices of a co-operative democracy in which men and women and youths act on their own initiative and according to their own judgments.

Herd-mindedness is the intended and actual outcome of military training. It leads to intolerance, group selfishness, and unnecessary war. It tends to part from intelligent international treatment of problems for world disaster.

Compulsory military training in public schools is contrary to the spirit and purposes of democratic society; it endangers the rational and peaceful settlements of domestic and international conflicts, and it stultifies youths and adults whom it keeps in a state of perpetual infantilism.

ROBERT K. SPEER, *New York University*

I am absolutely opposed to military training in our secondary schools. I myself suffered through three years of such training in my high school work. There it was compulsory.

My personal opinion is that military training helps a boy not at all. From a health point of view, it is not nearly as valuable as any decent recreational program.

Its value in case of need of defense is highly questionable. In this day and age soldiers do not go over the top in a dress parade formation. Really very little training is needed for the regular run of soldiers, and that little should be given in the regular formed armed forces—Army, Navy and Marines—and kept out of agencies devoting themselves to education and through education to social reconstruction.

MORRIS R. COHEN, *College of the City of New York*

I agree with all serious educators that there is no foundation whatsoever in the claims that military training has any educational value. It is conceived by militarists and not by educators.

JOHN DEWEY, *Columbia University*

Military training in schools cannot be defended on the ground of physical training. All authorities agree that so far as the health and development of the body are concerned, there are many better methods. From the military standpoint, it is entirely negligible. Its real purpose is to create a state of mind which is favorable to militarism and to war. It is a powerful agent in creating false standards. Now that war has been outlawed by agreement among the nations, it ought to be recognized that it is criminal to produce in the young, emotional habits that are favorable to war.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FOR INTERNATIONAL GOODWILL, THE TEACHERS UNION AUXILIARY, 72 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

LAFOLLETTE'S

Great National Weekly Newspaper

"The Progressive"

Regular price $1.50 per year

Startling facts suppressed by other papers are being exposed now. Political corruption, advertised fakes which poison and plunder the consumers, how the public is humbugged by propaganda in newspapers: these are some of the sensational revelations appearing in the next 10 issues.

Special offer 10 weeks for 20c

Open to new readers only.

Send 20 cents today for the next 10 sensational issues. The Progressive, Dept. 23 **Madison, Wis.**

WHO'S WHO IN OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

A book of intimate facts about the people who run your government. 136 pages with tables and charts.

Gives party affiliations, place of birth, racial descent, religious and fraternal affiliations, previous occupation and political offices held, and military service rendered, for the president, Supreme Court, cabinet, heads of bureaus, senators and representatives of the U. S. Also contains the Constitution, Declaration of Independence and miscellaneous information on government and political affairs.

For sale by The Fellowship Forum, 1065 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D. C. Price: 50 cents, stamps or coin. Order your copy today.